

**REMARKS**

Claims 1-33 are in the application. Claims 1 and 27 have been amended, and the remaining claims have been modified, where necessary, to correct their dependencies. Claims 2, 16, 17, and 29 have been cancelled. Reconsideration is respectfully requested in view of the following remarks. The following remarks are fully responsive to the Office Action and are believed to render all pending claims at issue patentably distinct over the cited references.

**I. CLAIM REJECTION UNDER 35 USC § 112**

Claims 1-14 were rejected as indefinite. By this amendment claim 1 has been amended to overcome the Examiner's rejection by defining more clearly the "at least a portion of which is larger" phrase.

**II. CLAIM REJECTION UNDER 35 USC § 102**

Claims 1, 6, 11-13, 15, 16, 21, and 27-29 were rejected under 35 USC § 102 as anticipated by Tolles '630 B1. Claim 1 has been amended to incorporate the feature of claim 2, claim 15 has been amended to incorporate the feature of claim 17, and claim 27 has been amended to incorporate the feature of claim 2. It is believed that the rejection under 35 USC § 102 has thereby been removed, as Tolles does not disclose the features now in the independent claims above.

### III CLAIM REJECTIONS UNDER 35 USC § 103

Claims 8, 9, 23, and 24 were rejected under 35 USC § 103 as obvious over Tolles in view of Birang et al. The base claims upon which each of the foregoing claims is dependent have been amended to overcome the Tolles reference, and therefore any combination with Tolles, so this rejection under 35 USC § 103 should also be overcome.

Claims 2-5, 7, 14, 17-20, 22-24, 26, and 30-32 were also rejected under 35 USC § 103 as unpatentable over Tolles in view of Birang and further in view of Fanshaw. These claims now depend from base claims that should be held allowable in view of the above remarks. Further, the Fanshaw reference relates to a totally unrelated technology (watches). There is no suggestion in any of the three cited references suggesting that they should be combined, or that one of ordinary skill in the semiconductor processing arts would think to combine them. The combination is therefore improper and should be withdrawn.

### IV. CONCLUSION


In view of Applicant's remarks, the Examiner's rejections are believed overcome. Accordingly, Applicant submits that the application is now in condition for allowance and such allowance is therefore earnestly requested. Should the Examiner have any questions or wish to further discuss this application, Applicant requests that the Examiner contact the undersigned at (480) 385-5060.

If for some reason Applicant has not requested a sufficient extension and/or has not paid a sufficient fee for this response and/or for the extension necessary to prevent abandonment of

this application, please consider this as a request for an extension for the required time period and/or authorization to charge Deposit Account No. 50-2091 for any fee which may be due.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated Sept 17, 2003

  
Anthony J. Sarli, Jr.  
Registration No. 24,517

Ingrassia Fisher and Lorenz  
7150 East Camelback Road  
Scottsdale, Arizona 85251

Customer No.: 29,906

RECEIVED  
CENTRAL FAX CENTER

SEP 22 2003

OFFICIAL